

1 NICOLA T. HANNA
 United States Attorney
 2 BENJAMIN R. BARRON
 Assistant United States Attorney
 3 Chief, Santa Ana Branch Office
 CHARLES E. PELL (Cal. Bar No. 210309)
 4 Assistant United States Attorney
 Santa Ana Branch Office
 5 Ronald Reagan Federal Bldg. & U.S. Courthouse
 411 West 4th Street, Suite 8000
 6 Santa Ana, California 92701
 Telephone: (714) 338-3542
 7 Facsimile: (714) 338-3561
 E-mail: Charles.E.Pell2@usdoj.gov

cc: psa/vsps

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 9 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. SA CR 18-000243-PSG

13 Plaintiff,

[PROPOSED] ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL
DATE AND FINDINGS REGARDING
EXCLUDABLE TIME PERIODS PURSUANT
TO SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

14 v.

15 MARGARET QUICK,

[PROPOSED] TRIAL DATE: 05/26/2020
 [PROPOSED] S/C DATE: 05/18/2020

16 Defendant.

17
 18 The Court has read and considered the Stipulation Regarding
 19 Request for (1) Continuance of Trial Date and (2) Findings of
 20 Excludable Time Periods Pursuant to Speedy Trial Act, filed by the
 21 parties in this matter. The Court hereby finds that the Stipulation,
 22 which this Court incorporates by reference into this Order,
 23 demonstrates facts that support a continuance of the trial date in
 24 this matter, and provides good cause for a finding of excludable time
 25 pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161.

26 The Court further finds that: (i) the ends of justice served by
 27 the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and
 28 defendant in a speedy trial; (ii) failure to grant the continuance

1 would be likely to make a continuation of the proceeding impossible,
2 or result in a miscarriage of justice; iii) the case is so unusual
3 and so complex, due to the nature of the prosecution and the
4 existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable
5 to expect preparation for pre-trial proceedings or for the trial
6 itself within the time limits established by the Speedy Trial Act;
7 and (iv) failure to grant the continuance would unreasonably deny
8 defendant continuity of counsel and would deny defense counsel the
9 reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into
10 account the exercise of due diligence.

11 THEREFORE, FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN:

12 1. The trial in this matter is continued from March 10, 2020,
13 to May 26, 2020. The status conference hearing is continued to May
14 18, 2020, at 10:00 a.m.

15 2. The time period of March 10, 2020, to May 26, 2020,
16 inclusive, is excluded in computing the time within which the trial
17 must commence, pursuant to pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h) (7) (A),
18 (h) (7) (B) (i), (h) (7) (B) (ii), and (h) (7) (B) (iv).

19 3. Defendant shall appear in Courtroom 6A of the Federal
20 Courthouse, 350 W. 1st Street, Los Angeles, California, on May __,
21 2020, at 8:30 a.m.

22 4. Nothing in this Order shall preclude a finding that other
23 provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time
24 periods are excluded from the period within which trial must
25 commence. Moreover, the same provisions and/or other provisions of
26 the Speedy Trial Act may in the future authorize the exclusion of


27 ///

28 ///

1 additional time periods from the period within which trial must
2 commence.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4
5 2/13/2020
6 DATE


7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
HONORABLE PHILIP S. GUTIERREZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE